UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

JUE ZHANG Plaintiff	
Tamuii	
v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-
MICHAEL P. GOLDFINGER, M.D., and SHRAGA N. GOLDBERG, M.D. Defendants	CIVIL ACTION NO. 04- RECEIPT # AMOUNT S SUMMONS ISSUED 15 LOCAL RULE 4
Detendants	waiver form
COMPLAINT AND DE	MCF ISSUED EMIAND FOR JURY TRIALBY DPTY CLK
	DATE

PARTIES

- 1. The Plaintiff, Jue Zhang Resides at E26 Mill Pond Road, Broad Brook, HartfordCounty, Connecticut.
- 2. Defendant Michael Goldfinger, M.D. is a physician duly licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At all times relevant hereto, said Defendant practiced radiology at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.
- 3. Defendant Shraga Goldberg, M.D. is a physician duly licensed to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At all times relevant hereto, said Defendant practiced radiology at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts.
- 4. The United States District Court has jurisdiction in this matter because of diversity of parties.
- 5. The amount in controversy exceeds the amount necessary to satisfy the jurisdictional requirements of this Court.

COUNT I (Negligence – Shraga Goldberg, M.D.)

- 6. Paragraphs 1 through 5 are incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein.
- 7. On or about November 8, 2001 and thereafter, the Defendant, Shraga Goldberg, M.D., for valuable consideration, undertook to treat and care for Plaintiff Jue Zhang.

- 8. It then and there became the duty of Defendant, Shraga Goldberg, M.D. to exercise that degree of care, diligence, and skill as is exercised by an average surgeon holding himself out in the field at the time in question.
- 9. Nevertheless, Defendant Shraga Goldberg, M.D. breached his duty and failed to exercise said degree of care, diligence and skill by negligently treating, recommending treatment for, supervising the care of, and by otherwise failing to render proper, adequate and necessary medical care and treatment of Plaintiff Jue Zhang.
- 10. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's negligence as aforesaid, Plaintiff Jue Zhang suffered severe and permanent injuries, endured and will in the future endure, great pain and suffering and mental anguish, has incurred and will in the future incur medical and other extraordinary expenses for their care and treatment, has and will in the future suffer a loss of earnings and earning capacity, and said Plaintiff was and otherwise is greatly injured.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jue Zhang, Individually, demands judgment against the Defendant Shraga Goldberg, M.D. in such an amount as a jury may deem proper, plus interest and costs.

<u>COUNT II</u> (Negligence – Michael Goldfinger, M.D.)

- 11. Paragraphs 1 through 10 are incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein.
- 12. On or about November 8, 2001 and thereafter, the Defendant, Michael Goldfinger, M.D., for valuable consideration, undertook to treat and care for Plaintiff Jue Zhang.
- 13. It then and there became the duty of Defendant, Michael Goldfinger, M.D. to exercise that degree of care, diligence, and skill as is exercised by an average surgeon holding himself out in the field at the time in question.
- 14. Nevertheless, Defendant Michael Goldfinger, M.D. breached his duty and failed to exercise said degree of care, diligence and skill by negligently treating, recommending treatment for, supervising the care of, and by otherwise failing to render proper, adequate and necessary medical care and treatment of Plaintiff Jue Zhang..
- As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant's negligence as aforesaid, Plaintiff Jue Zhang suffered severe and permanent injuries, endured and will in the future endure, great pain and suffering and mental anguish, has incurred and will in the future incur medical and other extraordinary expenses for their care and treatment, has and will in the future suffer a loss of earnings and earning capacity, and said Plaintiff was and otherwise is greatly injured.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jue Zhang, Individually, demands judgment against the Defendant Michael Goldfinger, M.D. in such an amount as a jury may deem proper, plus interest and costs

JURY DEMAND

The plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

The Plaintiffs, By their Attorneys,

Barry D. Lang, Esq.
BBO # 565438
Barry D. Lang, M.D. & Associates
One State Street, Suite 1050
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 720-0176

Dated: December 27, 2004

Zachary B. Lang, Esq. BBO# 652055

Barry D. Lang, M.D. & Associates One State Street, Suite 1050

Boston, MA 02109 (617) 720-0176

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, every as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the reverse of the Clerk of Court for the reverse of the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS				
Jue Zhang		Michael Goldfing	ger, M.D. and Shraga Go	ldberg, M.D.			
(b) County of Residence (F	of First Listed Plaintiff Hartford County (C'	NO and a series	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	Middlesex Cou. (2013) ONLY) UP LOCATION			
(c) At amore at an Nome	, Access, and Telephone Number	Ation (i) ii Kassa)		•			
•	ng, MD & Assoc, I State St, Ste 1050						
Boston, MA 02109 (617	7) 720-0176						
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	'RINCIPAL PARTIES	and One Box for Defendant)			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		TF DEF 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In Thi				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate City of Parties in Item II)	Citizen of Another State	2				
	· ·	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ② Enforcement of Judyment □ 151 Middirare Act □ 152 User by of Deft Succession □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 User Contract □ 190 User Contract □ 190 User Contract □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Tent to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Sunder 336 Tetral Employe 1 Sign Sign Sign Sign Sign Sign Sign Sign	1 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airdin Regs. 660 Occument Se5 710 Fan Labor Standards 720 Labor/Mgrat. Relations 730 Labor/Mgrat. Relations 740 Railway L. 790 Other Labor Endgation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 * rademark SUCIAL SEC() * Y □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 870 Taxes (C.S. Plantiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7620	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 500 Antibute 500 Appeal of Fee Determination 500 Appeal of Fee Determination 500 Constitutionality of State Statutes 500 Access to Justice 500 Constitutionality of State Statutes 500 Antibute 500 Constitutionality of State Statutes 500 Antibute 500 Constitutionality of State Statutes 500 Constitutionality of State			
💢 1 Original 🔲 2		Reinstated or anoth	sferred from ner district Litration Litration				
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	ON Brief & pile : December and a CT scan			September 2 September 2000 September			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		·		if demanded in complaint:			
VIII. TATES	F.(C)	,	porters, v. 15				
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	The state of the s						
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLYING IEP	/ THEY'RE	y MAG III	DCE			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

. Ca	stegory in wh	ich the case belongs	based upon	the numbered nature of	suit code lis	ted on the ci	vil cover she	et. (See
	cal rule 40.1(a							•
	_] I.	160, 410, 470, R.2	3, REGARD	LESS OF NATURE OF SI	UIT.			
	ff.	195, 368, 400, 44 740, 790, 791, 82	0, 441-444, 0*, 830*, 84(540, 550, 555, 625, 710, D*, 850, 890, 892-894, 89	, 720, 730, 95, 950.	*Also com for patent	iplete AO 12 t, trademark	0 or AO 121 or copyright (
	III.	110, 120, 130, 14 315, 320, 330, 34 380, 385, 450, 89	0, 345, 350,	210, 230, 240, 245, 290 355, 360, 362, 365, 370	, 310, , 371,			
	Į IV.	220, 422, 423, 43	0, 460, 510,	530, 610, 620, 630, 640	, 650, 660,			
production and	**	690, 810, 861-86	5, 870, 871, 1	375, 900.				
<u></u>	≟ V .	150, 152, 153.						
		se indicate the title al	na number o	ocal rule 40.1(g)). If mor f the first filed case in the based on the same clain	nis court.			
Da	4b 1				YES	NO	✓	
28	es the compla USC §2403)	ant in this case quest	ion the cons	titutionality of an act of	congress affe	ecting the pu	blic interest?	? (See
If s	o, is the U.S.A	A. or an officer, agent	or employee	of the U.S. a party?	YES	NO	\	
					YES	NO		
ls ti	his case requ	ired to be heard and o	determined t	y a district court of thre	e judges pur	suant to title	28 USC §228	84?
					YES [NO	1	
mas	all of the part ssachusetts (' (d)).	ies in this action, exc "governmental agenc	cluding gove ies"), resid	ernmental agencies of th ing in Massachusetts re	e united states	es and the Co	ommonwealt ? - (See Loc	h of al Rule
	A .	lf yes, in which div	rision do <u>all</u>	of the non-governments	YES VES	NO No de?	TO VALUE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	
		Eastern Division	\checkmark	Central Division		Western	Division	
	В.	if no, in which divi	sion do the i	majority of the plaintiffs nusetts reside?	or the only p	arties, exclud	ling governn	nental
		Eastern Division		Central Division		Western	Division	
	ng a Notice o	f Removal - are there arate sheet identifyin	any motions g the motion	pending in the state co	urt requiring t	the attention	of this Court	:? (If
lf fili yes,	submit a sep				YES	NO		
yes,								
yes, EASE TYI	PE OR PRINT)	ı ry D. Lang, Esq. /	Zachan/ F	Riana Esa	120			